



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANT: Donald B. Benson) ATTORNEY 03179524
SILVER BELL) DOCKET:
SERIAL NO.: 09/641,095) GROUP ART UNIT: 3639
FILED: August 17, 2000)
TITLE: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR COMBINED MAILING OF A PLURALITY
OF DIVERSE PUBLICATIONS (AS AMENDED)

Certificate of Mailing by "Express Mail"

"Express Mail" mailing label No. ER 885229915 US. Date of Deposit: April 11, 2006.
I hereby certify that this paper (and its recited enclosures) or fee is being deposited with the
United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 CFR 1.10
on the date indicated above and is addressed to: Mail Stop: AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O.
Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

ad Dominguez
(signature of person mailing paper or fee)

Adam Dominguez
(typed name of person mailing paper or fee)

Mail Stop: AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

ATTACHMENT TO PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Sir/Madam:

The Applicant submits this Attachment to the Pre-Appeal Brief Request For Review
pursuant to the *New Pre-Appeal Brief Conference Pilot Program*, 1296 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 67
(July 12, 2005)(as extended by the *Extension of the Pilot Pre-Appeal Brief Conference Program*
dated January 10, 2006).

I. Summary Of Clear Error Of Facts In Examiner's Rejection

To maintain an obviousness rejection, the Examiner states in a final rejection that "the Applicant has not disclosed that installing the print head at the co-mailer rather than at the bindery provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem, and the applicant's argument is therefore moot." 3/13/06 Final Office Action, p. 7. This statement is a clear error of the facts in this application since the Applicant specifically provided nearly two full pages of explanation and at least four citations to the specification as filed in the prior Response to provide evidence of the "advantage, ...particular purpose, or...[solved] problem" of having a "print head" at a particular location (co-mailer) in the system of the present invention. 12/8/05 Response, pp. 17-19. The Examiner apparently overlooked that evidence that rebutted the obviousness determination that would have resulted in allowance of independent claims 9, 18 and 28. The Applicant respectfully requests that this evidence be considered and that independent claims 9, 18 and 28 be allowed after reconsideration, as well as those claims depending on claims 9, 18 and 28.

II. Present Application

This application discloses a combined mailing ("co-mailing") system that includes a bindery and a co-mailer. Unlike prior co-mailing systems, the claimed invention calls for having a "first print head" and a "second print head" at the co-mailer of the system which has distinct advantages as described in the Applicant's 12/8/05 Response:

In contrast, the embodiment of the present invention claims 'print head(s)' at the co-mailer. By having the print head(s) at the co-mailer, the co-mailing system of the present invention has greater flexibility than the Mayer Reference to select the publications for co-mailing after binding. The co-mailer of the present invention prints the mail rate after the bindery at the co-mailer based on the total number of copies of the publications per zip code (or other 'identifier information') for all the publications to be co-mailed and as required by the USPS. This is unlike the Mayer Reference

that only prints address information at the bindery. The advantage is greater flexibility by printing the mail rate at the co-mailer versus the bindery since publications can be added at the co-mailer from other bindery runs and conforming to USPS requirements.

12/8/05 Response, pp. 17-18. *See also*, 12/8/05 Response, pp. 18-19, four bullet points.

III. The Examiner Committed Clear Error By Overlooking The Advantages Explained In The Applicant's Prior Response To Rebut The Obviousness Determination

In an August 11, 2005 Office Action, the Examiner admitted that the claimed “print head” of the present invention (located at a co-mailer rather than a bindery) was not disclosed in the primary reference cited (Mayer et al.). August 11, 2005 Office Action, p. 3. However, the Examiner found that the claimed “print head[s]” would have been obvious because a printer was disclosed at the bindery in Mayer et al. and the Applicant has “not disclosed that installing the print head at the co-mailer rather than at the bindery provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem.” *Id.*

In a December 8, 2005 Response, the Applicant specifically explained the importance of the location of the print head(s) and provided four instances quoted directly from the specification as filed that explained the “advantage, ...particular purpose, or...[solved] problem” that result from having the “print head[s]” at the co-mailer rather than at the bindery. December 8, 2005 Response, pp. 17-19.

In a Final Office Action dated March 13, 2006, the Examiner overlooked the four instances provided by the Applicant supporting the “advantage, ...particular purpose, or...[solved] problem,” and merely stated once again that “the Applicant has not disclosed that installing the print head at the co-mailer rather than at the bindery provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem, and the applicant's argument is therefore moot.” March 13, 2006 Final Office Action, p. 11.

The clear error is that the “advantage, ...particular purpose, or...[solved] problem” set forth in the December 8, 2005 Response, on pages 17-19, was overlooked by the Examiner. The fact that the Examiner affirmatively states that the “Applicant has not disclosed” these advantages when nearly two pages in the prior Response are devoted to the advantages shows that the Examiner erroneously missed those advantages. Had the Examiner noted the specific advantages provided, the Examiner would have appropriately allowed these claims over the Mayer et al. reference.

IV. Conclusion

The Applicant respectfully requests that the evidence of “advantage, ...particular purpose, or...[solved] problem” set forth in the Applicant’s December 8, 2005 Response be considered to rebut the obviousness rejection of claims 9, 18 and 28. Upon reconsideration, allowance of those claims, and those claims depend on claims 9, 18 and 28, is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael A. Molano
Reg. No. 39,777

Dated: April 11, 2006

CUSTOMER NO. 26565
MAYER, BROWN, ROWE & MAW LLP
P.O. Box 2828
Chicago, Illinois 60690-2828
(650) 331-2000